

REMARKS:

The present Response does not add, amend, or cancel any claims. Accordingly, Claims 1-8 remain pending in the application. Claims 1 and 8 are independent.

In the Office Action of March 30, 2004, the specification was objected to for failing to provide priority information.

Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of this objection as the Application Data Sheet already contains the priority information.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,589,728 issued to Levine, et al. ("Levine"). Claims 3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levine in view of U.S. Patent 5,521,461 issued to Garcia ("Garcia"). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levine. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 defines a column line structure for use in a cathode assembly of a FED. The column line structure comprises:

- a conductive structure;
- a resistive layer formed on said conductive structure; and
- an insulative layer formed partly over said resistive layer.

According to the column line structure of independent Claim 1, the insulative layer is formed partly over the resistive layer in order to eliminate one of the photolithography sequences. Elimination of such a step can advantageously reduce some of the costs associated with manufacturing the FED device. Furthermore, the possibility of shorting between the column and row lines can be reduced during times when the FED is in use. See page 10, lines 9-

11. The addition of the insulative layer further functions to reduce the distance between the conductive layer and the grid structure. This improves the refresh rate of the FED device because the RC constant associated with the circuit can be reduced. Accordingly, the claimed arrangement assists in achieving a better video rate during operation of the display device. The column line structure defined by independent Claim 1 also reduces the beam spot and improves display images because a thinner dielectric layer can be used. This, in turn, allows the use of smaller cavity openings around the emitter tips to be constructed. See page 10 lines 12 to 24.

The Office Action alleges that Levine discloses a column line structure that comprises a conductive structure, a resistive layer formed on the conductive structure, and an insulative layer formed partly over the resistive layer. This is not the case however. Levine does not appear to disclose a structure as set forth in independent Claim 1. First, the elements identified in the office action do not form part of a column line structure. Rather, the Office Action has identified various layers associated with an emitter plate. For example, the layers identified in the Office Action are merely fabricated on top of each other and do not actually form a column line structure. Notwithstanding this fact, Levine still fails to disclose the specific features recited in independent Claim 1. For example, the insulative layer (125) identified in the office action is formed entirely over the resistive layer (15). In contrast, independent Claim 1 specifically recites that an insulative layer is formed “partly over said resistive layer.” This feature is clearly not shown or suggested by Levine.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 is allowable over Levine because the features recited therein are not shown nor suggested by Levine or any of the art of record.

Claims 2 to 7 depend from independent Claim 1, and are therefore believed allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claim 1. In addition, these claims each introduce novel elements that are not shown nor suggested by the art of record or any combination thereof.

For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims (1-7 and 8) are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a notice of allowance is believed in order, and courteously solicited.

The Examiners respectfully requested to contact the undersign, if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Appln Ser. No.: 10/666,236
Office Action Dated: March 30, 2004
Amdt Dated: July 23, 2004

Patent
Docket No. 100718.422 (MIC-80DV)

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required for this Response, or credit any overpayment, to deposit account number 08-0219.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of which is required to make this response timely, and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such, to deposit account number 08-0219.

Respectfully submitted,



Leonid D. Thenor
Reg. No. 39,397

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
Willard Office Building
1455 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
202-942-8400

23 July 2004
Date